DRAFT

A public meeting of the Arizona Geographic Information Council was convened on **March 27, 2020 at 10:00** am on Webex. Present at the meeting were the following members or designees of the AGIC AZGeo Data Management Plan Work Group:

Table 1: Committee Voting Members

Member	Agency/Company	In Attendance
Nikki Eiden	AZ Department of Health Services	Yes, phone
Kasey Green	AZ State Land Department	Yes, phone
Jenna Leveille	AZ State Land Department	Yes, phone
Ayan Mitra	AZ State University	Yes, phone
James Meyer	AZ Department of Transportation	Yes, phone
David Olsen	AZ Department of Health Services	Yes, phone
Jill Sherwood	AZ State University	Yes, phone
Patrick Whiteford	AZ Department of Transportation	Yes, phone
Steve Whitney	Pima County	Yes, phone
Jeff Wolkove	AZ Department of Administration	Yes, phone

Table 2: Public Members At-Large

Member	Agency/Company	In Attendance
Sage Donaldson	AZ Department of Transportation	Yes
Shea Lemar	ASU	Yes
Ryan Johnson	AZ State Land Department	Yes

- Call to order: Meeting was called to order at 10:03 am; Introductions were made by the committee; around the table and on the phone, ensuring attendance list was managed and quorum established.
- II. <u>Approval of January meeting minutes:</u> Jenna asked for a motion to approve the February 7 meeting minutes. Nikki Eiden motioned; James Meyer seconded. There was no discussion. Motion passed unanimously.

III. Metadata Discussion – follow-up:

 Shea showed the group a metadata template spreadsheet she and Steve Whitney developed. It includes the minimum metadata requirements and their translation into esri specific metadata fields. The group agreed with the translation and discussed potentials for enforcement. Jenna asked for Jeff Wolkove's opinion as ADOA's State Data Architect. Jeff approved the

outline and minimum standards. Steve liked the examples and suggested that a select number of features be added to showcase an example. This will help ensure there are no gaps in our standard. Steve also suggested a template be produced under these guidelines.

Shea will ask her team to add examples of minimum and maximum metadata fields utilized to the metadata storymap/page on AZGeo; Steve volunteered to help develop these examples.

- Shea led the group in a discussion on template
 development/implementation and the possible limitations specific to data.
 She noted that North Carolina (NC) developed one to take a look at;
 simple spreadsheet explanation to autofill with descriptions. NC has
 examples of metadata on their website, this will need to be reviewed by
 the team. Jill volunteered take the first look and report back to the group
 (https://www.nconemap.gov/pages/metadata)
- Shea reported that enforcement of metadata standards is difficult in AGOL. Ayan recommended that outreach occur to ensure metadata standard is used by all contributing agencies.

IV. Key plan elements discussion/development:

 Roles/Responsibilities Defined: Shea showed the group a table she developed after discussions with Jenna on the user roles.

		MOST POPULAR			
	Public User	AZGeo User	AZGeo Data Contributor	AZGeo Group Admin	AZGeo Partner
View, search, download open data	~	~	~	✓	~
View, store, download group data*		~	~	✓	✓
Access group applications*		~	~	✓	✓
AZGeo user account on AGOL		~	~	✓	✓
Access AGOL applications**			~	✓	✓
Upload, share data to AZGeo			~	✓	✓
Create hosted feature services			~	✓	✓
Manage groups and members				✓	✓
Integrate custom applications					✓

^{*} User must be a member of a group to access a groups data or applications

^{**} User can access select AGOL applications and will receive 200 credits per year

She noted the new partner role and asked for feedback from the group:

Are these roles clearly defined? They can be developed further based on permissions documentation. The group overall agreed with the documentation so far but had additional questions, including who determines the roles for each user? Kasey Green will determine the roles and will assign users.

It was noted that accessing group applications (i.e. centerline unification app) will require a user to be a part of a group. Shea clarified that access to AGOL applications refers to the tools within AGOL. Custom applications are a different a workflow.

AZGeo user is more of a reader role; users vs creators. Access to AGOL apps will depend on user/functionality. Another option is to restrict the number of credits used. Jenna acknowledged that this has already been planned for.

The group agreed with Shea that the roles need flushed out more. They felt that defining the characteristics of AGOL access to applications would be helpful. They also thought potentially adding an AZGeo plus user may also be good. The goal is to ensure a novice user can't create issues with credits.

Authoritative data tag criteria: Steve began the discussion with his
observation from NSGIC; perspective of authoritative data providers rather
than data itself. He suggested that the group consider certification from the
data authority.

Group discussion followed. Questions included what about dual ownership data items? This would be defined by agency. Shea asked the group to clarify; isn't the goal of having all data on AZGeo be authoritative. The consideration is that some agency's data other agency's data and amalgamate it to a central data item. This external data creates challenges.

Steve provided the group with an Oregon example that details authoritative data; potentially use as basis with an Arizona flare.

The discussion turned to tagging. Tagging data as authoritative in AGOL requires it be done by the administrator. Should we create an Authoritative Group to share with? Then only authoritative shows up in Open Data Catalog. Possibly ask the hub team to add in authoritative as a tag to be able to filter on.

The group agreed to keep this as an agenda item for next meeting.

- V. <u>Hub Open data demo:</u> this item was tabled until the next meeting
- VI. <u>Next Steps Discussion</u>:
 - Documentation
- VII. <u>Information or Topics for Future Meetings:</u>
 - Need for formal document on metadata
 - The next meeting will be scheduled for April 10, 2020 at 10a.
- VIII. Adjourn: Adjourned at 11:09 am